



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/569,173

02/22/2006

Mark T. Johnson

GB030145

7872

24737

7590

07/27/2010

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

CRAWLEY, KEITH L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/27/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the selected sub-frames and brightness levels of Aoki (US 2002/0003520) fail to provide for a brightness level that is "substantially equal to said overall brightness level of said image," as is recited in the claims, and instead the brightness level of Aoki is greater than the initial overall brightness level.

Examiner disagrees, and Applicant's attention is drawn to claim 1, line 4-6, wherein it is recited "a controller for distributing said data signal over said display pixels to generate **an image on said display with an overall brightness value** for each display pixel during at least one frame period." (emphasis added) As is cited, in para. 48, Aoki discloses a control device 50 which distributes signals Sc1 and Sc2 to the signal line driver 5. The time averaged sum of the brightness levels of these two signals (Sc1 and Sc2) is in fact equal to the overall brightness level of the image displayed. Examiner agrees that, as is shown in para. 60 of Aoki, this brightness level is greater than that of the conventional pseudo impulse method. In other words, examiner agrees that, in general, the time averaged sum of the brightness levels of Sc1 and Sc2 will be greater than the brightness level of the **initial** data signal Sc (see para. 48). However, as is currently claimed, no distinction is made between an **initial** overall brightness level (e.g. the brightness level of Sc) and a **final** overall brightness level (e.g. the time averaged sum of Sc1 and Sc2). Thus, claims 1-13 stand as finally rejected.

Application/Control Number: 10/569,173

Page 3

Art Unit: 2629

/Bipin Shalwala/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629